

REMARKS

In accordance with the forgoing, claims 1 and 15 have been amended. Claims 1, 3-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17-23, 25, 26 and 28 are pending and under consideration. The following remarks are respectfully submitted.

I. Examiner's Response to Applicants' Argument

In the June 5, 2006 Second Response After Final submitted by Applicants, claims 1 and 15 were inadvertently amended to set forth "the second position is greater than the first position", when in fact the amendment was intended to be "the second distance is greater than the first distance", which feature was argued to overcome the rejections. In response, the Examiner points out that ". . . the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., ease of insertion) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)." and that "[t]herefore, Lim does teach a second position that is greater than a first position, in accordance with claims 1 and 15."

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to set forth the second distance is greater than the first distance, as originally intended, and the remarks set forth below have been re-written to set forth this feature to distinguish the claims from the referenced prior art documents.

II. Rejections Under 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 13, 15-17, 19-21 and 27 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,769,671 to Lim ("Lim"). Applicants respectfully assert that the claims of the present invention are patentably distinguishable from Lim and the rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention is directed to a connector assembly that includes a first deflection portion extending outward from at least one of the first inner surface and the second inner surface along the top portion of the first deflectable clip, and a second deflection portion extending outward from the at least one of the first inner surface and the second inner surface to be positioned between the first arm and the second arm, the second deflection portion deflecting the connector clip from a first position corresponding

to a first distance between the first arm and the second arm, to a second position corresponding to a second distance between the first arm and the second arm, wherein the second distance is greater than the first distance. As described in lines 6-11 of paragraph 36, of the present application, for example, such a feature allows for ease in inserting the terminal pin of the lead. (see also, paragraphs 42 and 55 of the present application)

As described at column 3, line 45 to column 4, line 65 of Lim, Lim teaches a locking collar 24 that is force fit within a larger diameter cylindrical surface 22 of a stepped bore 6 to maintain the contact spring within the gap 16 of the connector (See FIG. 3 to illustrate separate parts of the connector, 24 and 6). In this way, the contact spring is axially locked within the connector housing 4 and coaxially located with the central axis such that inwardly extending projections 25a-25d radially located on the spring yieldably interfere with the path followed by an inserted lead. Lim describes the spring 2 as “a generally closed shape member defined by opposed free ends 31 and 33, which in the relaxed condition, define a gap . . . 29” (Emphasis added; see column 4, lines 27-33 of Lim) and that in the assembled condition of the connector and before the lead is introduced into the opening 10, the free ends of the spring maintain a spacing of approximately 0.005 inch.

Therefore, assuming, *arguendo*, that Lim teaches the spring being inherently slightly deflected in the housing at a second position compared to before placement in the housing, such deflection would not ease the insertion of the terminal pin of the lead since the amount that the spring would need to be separated during insertion is increased. For at least this reason, Lim does not teach or suggest the second deflection portion deflecting the connector clip from a first position corresponding to a first distance between the first arm and the second arm, to a second position corresponding to a second distance between the first arm and the second arm, wherein the second distance is greater than the first distance, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 15 of the present invention. Therefore, claim 1 and claims 3-9, 11, 12, and 14 dependent thereon and independent claim 15 and claims 17-23, 25, 26 and 28 dependent thereon are patentably distinguishable from Lim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 USC § 103

Claims 4, 8-12, 14, 18, 22-26 and 28 stand rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim. The Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

As described above, Lim does not teach or suggest the second deflection portion deflecting the connector clip from a first position corresponding to a first distance between the first arm and the second arm, to a second position corresponding to a second distance between the first arm and the second arm, wherein the second distance is greater than the first distance, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 15 of the present invention. Therefore, claim 1 and claims 4 and 8-12 and 14 dependent thereon, independent claim 15 and claims 18, 22-26 and 28 dependent thereon are patentably distinguishable from Lim. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,

RIES et al.

December 19, 2006
Date

/Michael C. Soldner/
Michael C. Soldner
Reg. No. 41,455
(763) 514-4842
Customer No. 27581